



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,161	05/05/2005	Knut Kieschnick	DE02 0251 US	2596
65913	7590	03/31/2008	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V.			ABDIN, SHAHEDA A	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
M/S41-SJ			2629	
1109 MCKAY DRIVE				
SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/31/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[ip.department.us@nxp.com](mailto:ip.department.us@nxp.com)

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/534,161	KIESCHNICK ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
SHAHEDA A. ABDIN	2629	

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 7-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Richard Hjerpe/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Shaheda A Abdin  
 Examiner  
 Art Unit: 2629

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to claims 1 and 11, Applicant argues that, Takahara's reference does not disclose "some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit, the delay unit being used to store row voltage values for the control lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal is supplied to the delay units". However, Examiner disagree applicant's point of view. Note that Takahara's reference clearly teaches the above limitations in that the some of the gate lines (i.e. X1, X3) being connected to a plurality of delay units (i.e. 94) such that only every other gate lines is connected to a particular delay unit ( i.e. particular delay units (respective D- flipflop) for every other gate lines), the delay units (i.e. 94 for respective gate lines) being used to store row voltage values for the control lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal (GCKI) is supplied to the delay units" (column 11, lines 54-67, column 12, lines 1-30).

Applicant also argues that " the even numbered gate lines would be connected to simillar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b. Thus the cited reference of Takahara et al does not disclose the limitations of " only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit". However, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view . Note that the limitation "particular delay unit" is broad, it dosnot exclude "simi delay units" such as similar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b which is discloses at Takahara's reference because this claim limitation does not render that particular delay units must be in such that each gate lines must have different delay unit that means the gate lines would not be connected to simillar delay unit. Further more, Takahara's reference teaches that only every other control lines (i.e. each odd gate lines or even gates lines) is connected to particuler (respective) delay unit (D-flip- flop) .Tthus the reference of takahara meet the claim limitations. Same rationales are applicable to "every other data lines" as recited in claim11.